

1 Kevin N. Anderson  
Nevada Bar No. 4512  
2 David R. Hague (Admitted Pro Hac Vice)  
**FABIAN & CLENDENIN**  
3 215 South State Street, Suite 1200  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111-2323  
4 Telephone: 801-531-8900  
Facsimile: 801-596-2814  
5 Email: kanderson@fabianlaw.com  
dhague@fabianlaw.com

6 *Counsel for James M. Rhodes*

7  
8 **UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT**  
9 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

10 In re:  
11 THE RHODES COMPANIES, LLC, aka  
"Rhodes Homes," et al.,

12 Reorganized Debtors

13  
14  
15 ☒ Affects all Debtors  
16 ☐ Affects the following Debtors  
17  
18  
19  
20

Case No.: 09-14814-LBR  
(Jointly Administered)

Chapter 11

**EX PARTE MOTION FOR ORDER  
SHORTENING TIME FOR NOTICE  
AND HEARING ON MOTION TO  
QUASH ORDERS OF RULE 2004  
EXAMINATION AND  
CORRESPONDING SUBPOENAS  
AND/OR FOR PROTECTIVE ORDERS**

Hearing Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
Hearing Time: \_\_\_\_\_  
Place: Courtroom 1

21 James M. Rhodes ("**Rhodes**"), through counsel, hereby respectfully moves this Court  
22 pursuant to Fed. R. Bankr. P. 9006 and Local Rule 9006 for an order shortening time for notice  
23 and hearing on Rhodes' *Motion to Quash Orders of Rule 2004 Examination and Corresponding*  
24 *Subpoenas and/or For Protective Orders* (the "**Motion**"), filed by Rhodes on September 14, 2011  
25 (Docket No. 1538). In support hereof, Rhodes states as follows:  
26

1           1.       The Court is currently scheduled to hear the claims remaining on the Reorganized  
2 Debtors' objection to the Greenway Partners Claim and the Scheduled Claims on September 27,  
3 2011 at 10:30 a.m. (Docket No. 1495).

4           2.       On August 30, 2011 and August 31, 2011, without allowing time for objections,  
5 the Court entered four orders granting Rule 2004 examinations of various financial institutions  
6 (Docket No. 1512), law firms (Docket No. 1518), title companies (Docket No. 1517) and other  
7 professionals (Docket No. 1519).

8           3.       In spite of Fed. R. Civ. P. 45(b)(1), which mandates that if a "subpoena commands  
9 the production of documents . . . , then before it is served, a notice must be served on each party,  
10 on August 31, 2011, without notice to anyone, the Litigation Trust sent several expansive  
11 subpoenas requesting vast amounts of irrelevant, privileged, confidential and personally  
12 identifiable information (the "**Rule 2004 Subpoenas**").

13           4.       On September 14, 2011, Rhodes filed his *Motion to Quash Orders of Rule 2004*  
14 *Examination and Corresponding Subpoenas and/or For Protective Orders* asking the Court to  
15 quash the Rule 2004 Subpoenas because, among other things, they lack good cause and are overly  
16 expansive. (Docket No. 1538). Alternatively, Rhodes' Motion asks the Court to issue a  
17 protective order limiting the scope of the Rule 2004 Subpoenas and protecting the confidential  
18 information sought.

19           5.       Pursuant to Rule 9006 of the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure and Local  
20 Rule 9006, the Court may, for cause, enter an order shortening time for notice and hearing. *See*  
21 Fed. R. Bankr. P. 9006; Local Rule 9006.

22           6.       Here, the expansive scope of the Rule 2004 Subpoenas and the short period  
23 required for the subpoenaed entities to comply demand that this matter be resolved promptly.  
24 Otherwise, the subpoenaed entities may produce privileged, confidential and personally  
25 identifiable information pursuant to the improper requests.

26

WHEREFORE, in the interests of efficiency and to promptly resolve the issues surrounding the Rule 2004 Subpoenas, Rhodes respectfully requests that the Court shorten the time for notice and hearing on the Motion. Specifically, Rhodes moves the Court to hear the Motion at the hearing already scheduled for September 27, 2011. To that end, Rhodes requests an objection deadline of September 23, 2011 with a corresponding reply deadline of September 26, 2011.

/s/ Kevin N. Anderson

4811-6070-8874, v. 1